

From: Boris Kesil
Multimetrixs LLP
1040 Di Giulio Avenue #200
Santa Clara, CA 95050

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 25 2005

Fax 703-872-9306

Please transmit this letter to Examiner Paul T. Chin/3652

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

Re:

App. Ser. No.	09/944,605
Application Filed:	09/04/2001
Applicants:	Boris Kesil, et al.
Appn Title:	PRECISION SOFT-TOUCH GRIPPING MECHANISM FOR FLAT OBJECTS
Examiner/GAU:	Paul T.Chin/3652

Attached is the response on 2 pages

Re: Response to Office Action of 01/31/2005
Request for election of species

Commissioner for Patents
Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sincerely,

Boris Kesil
1040 Di Giulio Avenue #200
Santa Clara, CA 95050

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 25 2005

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

App. Ser. No.	09/944,605
Application Filed:	09/04/2001
Applicants:	Boris Kesil, et al.
Appn. Title:	PRECISION SOFT-TOUCH GRIPPING MECHANISM FOR FLAT OBJECTS
Examiner/GAU:	Paul T. Chin/3652

Santa Clara, CA 02/25 2005

Re: Response to Office Action of 01/31/2005
Request for election of species

Commissioner for Patents
Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Please, disregard our Amendment A contained in our response of November 12, 2004. This amendment is not related to the request of election of species. We apologize for the confusion. We prepared our application and response ourselves without attorney's assistance. Therefore, please ignore the remarks regarding cancellation of the claims.

The examiner pointed out to the following three species which, in the Examiner's opinion, relate to three different inventions:

- 1) the species of Figs. 1, 2, 5, 11, and 13;
- 2) the species of Fig. 8
- 3) the species of Fig. 12.

The Examiner indicates that Fig. 8 distinctly shows a base (44), which other species do not disclose.

We cannot agree with the above statement since the entire set of apparatus claims from 1 to 50 relates to one and the same species. The base (44) is shown and designated not only in Fig. 8 but also in Fig. 1, Fig. 2, 11, and in other figures where it not necessarily designated.

In our opinion, the Examiner slightly misunderstood the main concept. The confusion, probably, results from the fact that in Fig. 8 the base (44) is shown entirely while on some other drawings it is shown partially in order not to overcrowd the drawings. For example, Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 show the rear part of the base (44) while the remaining part is conventionally shown as a hatched guide for the linking member or finger 22. Regarding the mechanism shown in Fig. 12, we do not consider it a separate species as all the figures in fact show slight modifications of one and the same kinematic scheme that allows control of soft-touch gripping.

In view of the above, we elect the species covered by Claims 1 to 20 that are shown in Figs. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

We will call the Examiner next week, on March 1, 2005.

Sincerely,

Applicants: *E. Geshenzer, D. Margulies, Boris Kesil*
Boris Kesil
1040 Di Giulio Avenue #200
Santa Clara, CA 95050